

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 were pending and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-13 have been amended, new claim 14 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-14 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Nakagaki.

The present invention is a system that records process history information for a number of distinct systems. This recording is performed to facilitate tracking of electronic data interchange information, such as orders, order acceptances, etc. In the present invention the process history information of the systems is "collectively" stored in a "shared" storage medium that is shared by the distinct systems. Each of the distinct systems, as a result, has access to the process history information on the shared storage medium and thus the information can be "commonly" accessed by the distinct systems. This collective shared storage with common access allows each of the distinct systems to track ("tracked") the process information and "process history". (see claims 1, 4, and 7-13)

The Examiner alleges a correspondence between the present invention and Nakagaki particularly pointing to figure 9 and the alleges that the distribution history holding section 15 of Nakagaki is shared storage. The distribution history holding section 15 of Nakagaki is not shared storage but information associated with the distribution history holding section 15 must be transmitted and received between the information intervention systems A-D. That is, the distribution history holding section 15 is local storage not shared, commonly accessed, collective storage as is the case in the present invention. This local storage nature of the distribution history holding section 15 is particularly described in Nakagaki:

When an instruction for tracing the distribution route of the information X is given in the information intervention system A, the distribution history of the information X is fetched from the distribution history holding section 15 of the information intervention system A and the information intervention system B to which the information X was distributed is instructed to trace the distribution route of the information X. Upon reception of the instruction for tracing the distribution route of the information X from the information intervention system A, the information intervention system B fetches the distribution history of the information X from its distribution history holding section 15 and instructs the information intervention systems C and D to which the information X was distributed to trace the distribution route of the information X. The information intervention systems C and

D, which do not hold the distribution history of the information X, return a message to the effect that the distribution history related to the information X does not exist to the information intervention system A. The information intervention system B returns the distribution histories recorded when the information X was distributed to the information intervention systems C and D to the information intervention system A, whereby the information intervention system A can know that the information X was distributed as shown in FIG. 4. Thus, the information intervention system A can analyze the distribution route, distribution range, etc., of the information X.

(See Nakagaki, col. 11, line 63 - col. 12, line 21)

The requirement that the system B be instructed to trace the distribution route by system A, and that system B, based on this instruction from A, fetches the contents of the B distribution history holding section 15 and reviews its contents, indicates that B is doing a local search and that the A system does not have common, shared, collective access to the distribution history holding section 15 of system B. This teaching of the local access approach is further reinforced by the fact that system B instructs systems C and D to also trace the distribution route by performing local searches based on the instruction from system A. Nakagaki does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention discussed above and emphasized in claims 1, 4 and 7-13.

It is submitted that the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over Nakagaki and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claims 2 and 5 emphasize that output identification information is generated by concatenating input identification information and service identification information. This is not taught or suggested by Nakagaki. The Examiner alleges a correspondence between the "sent id-X to id-B at T1", "id-X", "sent id-X to id-C at T2" and service identification information, input identification information, output identification information. The combination of "sent id-X to id-B at T1" and "id-X" does will not generate "sent id-X to id-C at T2". Further even if it did there would be no concatenation. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claim 14 emphasizes the collective, shared, common access to business transaction process history allowing tracking by the systems that generate and process the transactions. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.


It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/5/13

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501